APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,686	09/29/2003	Kazuma Aoki	117025	1077

25944   7590   09/03/2008
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
KEEFER, MICHAEL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>5/14/2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed 5/14/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action

can be found in a prior Office action.

2.   Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 9, 11, 13, 15-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Susaki et al. (US 6189032 B1), hereafter

Susaki in view of Shitama (US 2002/0110123).

Regarding **claims 1, 3, 6, and 9**, Susaki discloses:

A communication device (Fig. 1, server 2) connected with a wide

area network (WAN) and a local area network (LAN) (communication

network 3), comprising:

a controller (see Fig. 3) that:

determines whether a request to perform predetermined

processing came in from the WAN or the LAN; (Col 9, Lines 38-48

describes the process of the controller determining whether a

request requires the approval of another user)

allows a user of the communication device to determine

whether an operation according to the request is accepted or

rejected when it is determined that the request came in from the

WAN (Col. 10, Lines 1-7 describe how a user is allowed to

determine whether a request is allowed or rejected) ; and

allows the predetermined processing to be performed
according to the request when a performance of the operation
according to the request is accepted. (Col 10, lines 7-9 and 14-18
state that the request is granted and made to process if the request
is granted by the other user)

a display unit that displays an inquiry about whether the
performance of the operation according the request is accepted or
rejected (See display unit 23 in Fig. 3); and

an input unit through which the user can input an answer of
whether the request is accepted or rejected in response to the inquiry.
(See input unit 24 in Fig. 3)

wherein the display unit and the input unit are provided at an
operating portion. (It is inherent that the display and input units must be in
an operating portion, or else they would not function as disclosed by
Susaki.)

the controller demands a user of a LAN terminal to determine
whether the performance of the operation according to the request is
accepted or rejected when it is determined that the request came in from
the WAN. (Col. 10, Lines 1-7 describe how a user is allowed to determine
whether a request is allowed or rejected)

wherein the controller demands the user of the communication
device to determine whether the performance of the operation according
to the request is accepted or rejected only when the received request

involves predetermined online real-time processing, which is a specified request from the WAN. (Col. 9 lines 42-48 disclose that not only is a user's authority taken into account when determining if a demand for approval is made to a user, but also the type of the request.)

wherein the controller:

exclusively sets a first operation mode in which the determination of whether the performance of the operation is accepted or rejected is demanded; and

sets a second operation mode in which the controller allows the predetermined processing to be performed according to the request that comes in from the WAN when the performance of the operation is accepted aside from the first operation mode. (Note in Fig. 5 it is disclosed that the operation mode can be changed by changing the access limits for a particular service or services to either require another user to approve the request, or to automatically allow the request. See Col. 7, lines 65-67 and Col. 8 lines 1-9)

the controller informs a WAN terminal, that made the request, of a result of the determination by the user of the communication device as to the performance of the operation. (Fig. 11, items 3014 and/or 3018 both inform the requestor of the disposition of the request.)

Therefore, Susaki discloses all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-7, and 9 except for the selection criteria specifically being whether a user is

located on a LAN or a WAN and that all LAN requests are allowed to proceed automatically.

The general concept of determining whether requests come from a LAN or WAN, as well as the concept of automatically allowing all requests from a LAN are well known in the art as taught by Shitama. ([0052], it is determined that request came from the WAN by determining what interface the request came from, and additionally by determining the IP address associated with the request in [0053], further, Shitama generally teaches that greater security is needed when handling requests that originate from a WAN, whereas all requests from the LAN are trusted, Note at least paragraph 11, which discusses limiting and authorizing requests from a WAN, but implicitly allows all local requests for local resources.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Susaki with the general concept of determining whether requests come from a LAN or WAN, and applying stricter security criteria to requests from a WAN as taught by Shitama. Regarding **claims 11, 13, and 15-18**, Susaki discloses:

A method of communicating with a wide area network (WAN) and a local area network (LAN) connected to a communication device, comprising:

determining whether a request to perform predetermined processing came in from the WAN or the LAN; (Col 9, Lines 38-48

describes determining whether a request requires the approval of another user)

allowing a user of the communication device to determine whether an operation according to the request is accepted or rejected when it is determined that the request came in from the WAN (Col. 10, Lines 1-7 and 14-18 describe how a user is allowed to determine whether a request is allowed or rejected); and

allowing the predetermined processing to be performed according to the request when a performance of the operation according to the request is accepted. (Col 10, lines 7-9 state that the request is granted and made to process if the request is granted by the other user)

displaying an inquiry about whether the performance of the operation according the request is accepted or rejected; (Fig. 15 shows the display of an inquiry) and

inputting a user answer of whether the request is accepted or rejected in response to the inquiry. (Because in Col 10, lines 7-9 state that the client terminal sends back approval information, it must have been input at some time, via a button on the dialog in Fig. 15. Also see Col. 11, lines 56-62.)

wherein a user of a LAN terminal must determine whether the performance of the operation according to the request is accepted or rejected when it is determined that the request came in from the WAN.

(Col. 10, Lines 1-7 describe how a user is allowed to determine whether a request is allowed or rejected)

wherein the user of the communication device must determine whether the performance of the operation according to the request is accepted or rejected only when the received request involves predetermined online real-time processing, which is a specified request from the WAN. (Col. 9 lines 42-48 disclose that not only is a user's authority taken into account when determining if a demand for approval is made to a user, but also the type of the request.)

setting, exclusively, a first operation mode in which the determination of whether the performance of the operation is accepted or rejected is demanded; and

setting a second operation mode in which the controller allows the predetermined processing to be performed according to the request that comes in from the WAN when the performance of the operation is accepted aside from the first operation mode. (Note in Fig. 5 it is disclosed that changing the access limits for a particular service or services to either require another user to approve the request, or to automatically allow the request can change the operation mode. See Col. 7, lines 65-67 and Col. 8 lines 1-9)

informing a WAN terminal, that made the request, of a result of the determination by the user of the communication device as to the

performance of the operation. (Fig. 11, items 3014 and/or 3018 both inform the requestor of the disposition of the request.)

Therefore, Susaki discloses all the limitations of claims 11, 13, 15, and 18 except for the selection criteria specifically being whether a user is located on a LAN or a WAN.

The general concept of determining whether requests come from a LAN or WAN, as well as the concept of automatically allowing all requests from a LAN are well known in the art as taught by Shitama. ([0052], it is determined that request came from the WAN by determining what interface the request came from, and additionally by determining the IP address associated with the request in [0053], further, Shitama generally teaches that greater security is needed when handling requests that originate from a WAN, whereas all requests from the LAN are trusted, Note at least paragraph 11, which discusses limiting and authorizing requests from a WAN, but implicitly allows all local requests for local resources.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Susaki with the general concept of determining whether requests come from a LAN or WAN, and applying stricter security criteria to requests from a WAN as taught by Shitama. Regarding **claim 20**, Susaki discloses:

A communication device connected with a wide area network (WAN) and a local area network (LAN), comprising:

a controller that:

automatically performs predetermined processing according to a request when a performance of an operation is requested by a LAN (Col. 9 lines 57-67 disclose that if a client is in a group that does not require approval the request is automatically granted);

allows a user of the communication device to determine whether an operation according to the request is accepted or rejected when it is determined that the request came in from the WAN (Col. 10, Lines 1-7 and 14-18 describe how a user is allowed to determine whether a request is allowed or rejected); and

performs predetermined processing according to a request from the WAN when a performance of the operation according to the request is accepted. (Col 10, lines 7-9 states that the request is granted and made to process if the other user grants the request.)

Therefore, Susaki discloses all the limitations of claim 20 except that the defining characteristic of the two groups is their presence on a LAN or a WAN.

The general concept of determining whether requests come from a LAN or WAN, as well as the concept of automatically allowing all requests from a LAN are well known in the art as taught by Shitama. ([0052], it is determined that request came from the WAN by determining what interface the request came from, and additionally by determining the IP address associated with the request in [0053], further, Shitama generally

teaches that greater security is needed when handling requests that
originate from a WAN, whereas all requests from the LAN are trusted,
Note at least paragraph 11, which discusses limiting and authorizing
requests from a WAN, but implicitly allows all local requests for local
resources.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time of the invention to modify Susaki with the general concept of
determining whether requests come from a LAN or WAN as taught by
Shitama.

3.   Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Susaki and Shitama as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and
further in view of Joubert et al. (US 6101616), hereafter Joubert.

Susaki and Shitama teach all the limitations of **claims 2 and 12**
except for an IP address table used to differentiate between terminals.

The general concept of using IP addresses to identify terminals on
a network is well-known in the art as taught by Joubert (Col. 2, lines 22-25
teach that a table is used to correspond IP addresses to terminal MAC
addresses for unique identification, further, lines 30-36 teach that
terminals should use their IP address in LAN communications and that
unique terminals can be identified by using a table to look up a
correspondence between an IP address and a unique MAC address).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time of the invention to modify Susaki and Shitama with the general

concept of using IP addresses to identify terminals on a network as taught

by Joubert in order to be more robust.

4.   Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Susaki and Shitama as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and

further in view of Allen et al. (US 2003/0041333 A1), hereafter Allen.

Susaki and Shitama teach all of the limitations of **claims 5 and 14** except for

the requester being notified if the authorization request times out.

The general concept of notifying a requester if a request times out

is well-known in the art as taught by Allen ("the user rejecting the request

or not accepting the request within an established time interval a pre-

recorded video greeting is sent" Abstract lines 5-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify Susaki and Shitama with the teaching of

notifying a requester if a request times out as taught by Allen in order to

increase user efficiency.

5.   Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Susaki and Shitama as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and

further in view of Boehmke et al. (US 2002/0126822 A1) hereafter Boehmke.

Susaki discloses that a server provides "services" but does not

specifically define them.

Susaki and Shitama teach all the limitations of **claims 10 and 19**

except for that the request received from the LAN or the WAN is at least

one of: performance of a printing operation, transmission of facsimile data,

reading of data from detachably attachable memory, setting change of device, and reading of received facsimile data, and processing is performed in accordance with the received request. Susaki merely teaches that the server provides "services".

The general concept of a server being able to provide printing and facsimile related services is well-known in the art as taught by Boehmke ([0062] teaches that a server may transmit data to one or more peripheral devices such as printers and facsimiles, among others).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Susaki and Shitama with the teaching of a server being able to provide printing and facsimile related services as taught by Boehmke in order to make the server more versatile.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7.   Applicant argues that because Susaki includes different levels of authorization, a combination of Susaki and Shitama would not automatically accept all requests from the LAN. While Applicant's statements about Susaki including different possible user levels is correct, it does not hold that all of the levels of scrutiny must be used in a combination with Shitama. In fact, as the Examiner has stated in the above rejection of the independent claims (1, 11, and 20) above, Shitama teaches that scrutiny only needs to be applied to requests that emanate from the WAN, whereas requests from the LAN are always fulfilled.

Therefore, in a combination with Susaki, one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention would place all LAN address as having a user authority level

of '0' in the table of Fig. 5 (i.e. 'Always processable').

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone

number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday

through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 8/28/2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2146